

gap for federal employees, reforming the Hatch Act, securing the right to initiate mid-term bargaining and to engage in informational picketing are all significant achievements with long lasting effects.

These actions will continue to directly impact America's working people and their families and the people they serve for years and years to come. The impact of these actions cannot be overstated.

Like many of his friends, I will miss Mr. Tobias' visionary leadership, his strong support and his hard work at NTEU. The union, its membership, the vast federal workforce and indeed this Congress are all the better for his stewardship at NTEU.

I thank Robert Tobias for his dedication and his efforts on behalf of America's federal employees and wish him the very best of luck.

#### NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE ACT OF 1999

### HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week the President signed H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, into law. This measure unequivocally states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as it is technologically feasible. In signing the bill, the President has at long last acknowledged that the missile threat that he has so long denied, and the need to defend against it.

Mr. Speaker, there was no signing ceremony, no fanfare, not even a press conference announcing this significant action. Unfortunately, there is a reason the President chose to downplay this event. In characteristic style, he is already trying to redefine the meaning of this law. The ink on the bill was not dry when the President released a statement noting that the "legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. . . . Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense. . . ." This is Orwellian. The President signs a bill that says that it is our policy to deploy a national missile defense, and in the same breath says that a decision to deploy will be made next year. It would be comical if the stakes were not so high.

I guess we should not be surprised anymore. The President has already successfully redefined the word "is," and once again it provides him with a convenient escape hatch. Perhaps we should have reconsidered the use of that word in our policy statement before submitting it to the President, because he has already made it clear that to him, "is" does not always mean "is." But most people understand that when we say it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, that the decision to deploy has been made. The question is not whether to deploy, only when. And contrary to the President's interpretation, Congress was clear on this point.

Before the House voted on this measure, both the original bill and the conference report, I called on my colleagues to vote against this bill if they agreed with the President that we should hold off the decision on whether to de-

ploy, and told those who agreed with moving forward with that decision now to vote for it. There was considerable discussion about whether we could deploy a system now. It was repeatedly noted that the bill was not mandating when to deploy, it was simply stating that the decision was being made to do so as soon as it is technologically feasible. Similar debate ensue in the Senate.

This time, the President says that Congress itself has qualified that it "is" the policy to deploy. He argues that the bill language subjecting deployment to the authorizations and appropriations process means that no decision has been made. That argument is a Trojan horse, because all policy decisions are subject to the authorization and appropriations process. He further argues that the bill's language supporting continued reductions in strategic nuclear arms means that the decision must account for arms control and nuclear non-proliferation objectives. Congress said nothing of the sort, and made absolutely no linkage of these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of tortured linguistics by this President or anyone else can change the legislative record. We were clear that passage of this bill would formalize U.S. policy to deploy a national missile defense system, and it was overwhelmingly adopted in both bodies. It is time for the President to stop rewriting the dictionary, and get down to the business of executing the law and ensuring the security of this nation.

#### THE RETIREMENT OF DDO JACK DOWNING

### HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the contributions of Jack Downing, CIA's Deputy Director of Operations, or DDO, to the security and well-being of this Nation. Just this once, on the occasion of Jack's retirement on 31 July, I want to bring this remarkable man, our Nation's "head spy," out of the shadows and into the spotlight of this forum.

Barely 2 years ago, Jack was pulled out of an earlier retirement from CIA to take over its directorate of operations, or DO, at a time when the morale, sense of mission, and strength of the DO had been sapped by careerism, corridor politics, and lack of leadership. At that time, I knew only two things about Jack: first, he couldn't be a careerist because he had already retired once. Second, he couldn't be a "corridor cowboy" back in Washington because he had spend almost all of his legendary career in the field where case officers belong. Jack, in fact, was our chief of station on the very front lines of the cold war.

What I did not know at the time, and what now causes me to offer this tribute, is the leadership that Jack would bring to the DO and to its officers. In two short years, Jack has refocused the DO on its core capability: the clandestine collection of intelligence. Under Jack, DO officers have found ways to penetrate terrorist cells, to get inside the cabinet rooms of rogue states, and to detect and disrupt the movement of narcotics. Under Jack, the DO has been put in a position to collect

intelligence on whatever threats and challenges come our way in the next century.

Jack's leadership, however, is more than these accomplishments. In the unique, often peculiar, business of espionage, the DDO is more than someone who directs the operations of the DO; for young officers, particularly, the DDO is a role model in the clandestine service. And the DO, in my opinion, has never had a better role model than Jack Downing.

As chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, I visit stations overseas and talk with the young officers who hop fences, slip down alleys, and take real risks to collect the intelligence we need back here in Washington.

Over the past 2 years, the change I have seen in these young officers overseas has been extraordinary. Where there used to be malaise is now a sense of mission. Where there used to be risk aversion is now a feeling of confidence. Perhaps the most telling change under Jack Downing, and most central to the character of this former marine, is that his troops at risk in the field know that he will stand behind them when things go wrong.

I can offer no higher tribute than what Jack's own troops think of him. I commend this man for what he is and what he has done. Our country is and will be a better place because of him.

Godspeed, to Jack Downing, you are "the right stuff" and have served us well.

#### DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREAT- MENT TO PRODUCTS OF PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1999

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending normal trade relations status to China for another year. I oppose this resolution and call upon my colleagues to vote against it.

As events over the past week have shown, the human rights situation in China needs to improve. Increased respect for human rights must be accompanied by political and democratic reforms. But let us not forget that our own country's record on certain human rights issues is less than perfect, as has been noted by such organizations as Amnesty International. Over 1.8 million Americans are in jail, most of them for non-violent crimes and many of them—and this is not an accident—coming from our country's worst schools. Given our own record, we should avoid hypocrisy in our insistent demands for reform in China.

Rather, we should be pragmatic in our efforts and pursue a productive engagement with Chinese society. The only way we can convey our values to other countries is to have a presence there, and to let them see who we are and how we succeed in having a better life. That means that along the way we must also raise our own country's standards and expectations so that we can show by example.

Entering the next century, the United States is experiencing a remarkable economic boom. However, as we work to maintain our technological leadership and the growth of 21st century jobs, we should also keep in mind the